UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,283	01/16/2002	Hun Gun Park	RPL-0026	2369

34610 7590 06/04/2004

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP
P.O. BOX 221200
CHANTILLY, VA 20153

EXAMINER	
LEFLORE, LAUREL E	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2673	7

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/046,283	PARK, HUN GUN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laurel E LeFlore	2673	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 25 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

   (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

   (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____.

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 USC 112 rejection of claims 1-20.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: *1-9*.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: *10-17 and 19-20*.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____

JOSEPH MANCUSO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

1. The following is an explanation of how the amended claims would be rejected:

a. Claims 10, 11, 14-17 and 19 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagano 6,531,994 B1 in view of Ide et al. 2001/0026254 A1.

b. Claim 12 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagano 6,531,994 B1 in view of Ide et al. 2001/0026254 A1 as applied to claim 10, and further in view of the Journal of Applied Physics article, "Global breakdown in an alternating current plasma display panel" by Ikeda et al.

c. Claim 13 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagano 6,531,994 B1 in view of Ide et al. 2001/0026254 A1 as applied to claim 10, and further in view of Lim et al. 6,473,061 B1.

d. Claim 20 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagano 6,531,994 B1 in view of Ide et al. 2001/0026254 A1 as applied to claim 10, and further in view of Alymov et al. 6,587,084 B1.

2. Applicant's remarks regarding the 35 USC 112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 1-20 are persuasive. The 35 USC 112, first paragraph, rejection of Paper Nos. 3 and 5 is withdrawn.

3. Applicant's arguments filed 25 May 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. Applicant's remarks regarding the previous rejection of claims 18 and 19 are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by

combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, as stated on page 12 in the applicant's remarks of Paper No. 6, the examiner finds a motivation to combine the features of Nagano and Ide since both references relate to methods of driving a plasma display panel and further that both references relate to methods of driving scan electrodes 1 to N.

Further, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

5. Applicant's remarks regarding the rejection of claim 13 are not persuasive. Examiner acknowledges that the office action (Paper No. 5) relies on Lim to reject claim 13. However, the applicant must submit proof that Lim and the present application were commonly assigned at the time the invention was made in order to overcome the rejection.